MINUTES

COMMUNITY POLICE REVIEW COMMISSION

City of Riverside January 22, 2001, 6 p.m. Art Pick Council Chambers

Present: Commissioners Brewer, Egson, Garcia, Gardner, Goldware, Hendrick, Howe, Huerta and

Redsecker

Absent:

Interim Chair Garcia called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. and dedicated this meeting to Riverside Police Detective Doug Jacobs, who was killed in the line of duty on January 13, 2001.

Motion was made by Commissioner Brewer and seconded by Commissioner Howe to approve the minutes for the monthly meeting of December 2000. The motion passed unanimously.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT / COMMENTS

Executive Director Williams spoke about the Study Circle information given to the commissioners. He asked that they review it and call the CPRC office if they are interested in participating.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mary Shelton commented positively regarding the color of the posted agenda, saying that the yellow paper stands out and helps to identify our agenda from among the others that are posted. She also said that the promotional policy of the RPD needs to be reviewed, saying that inappropriate personnel are being promoted into supervisory positions.

David Kessinger asked that the Commission recess for Agenda Items 5 - 7 as there was a time conflict with the CPRC meeting and a meeting regarding block grants that he wanted to attend.

Doug Leeper spoke regarding the death of Det. Jacobs and expressed concern over the ability of the Commission to make educated decisions about the cases they will review.

TRAINING – Sue Quinn, President, National Assoc. for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement Executive Director Don Williams introduced Ms. Quinn, who presented an overview of civilian oversight. Ms. Quinn began by saying that NACOLE was formed because the International Assoc. for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement wasn't giving enough real information to U. S. review boards.

She spoke about the various models of oversight within the United States, saying that any can work or fail and that success depends on the community's political will to make them work along with the hard work that will be done by the commissioners. She said that CPRC is a hybrid model that will mainly monitor Internal Affairs investigations, but that it has the authority to conduct its own investigations and use subpoena power should the need arise. She said that a common factor of all models is the function to help the law enforcement departments provide firm, fair and consistent policing and to help the mangers of those departments to be better managers. She stated that a monitoring model's principal function is to help

Internal Affairs conduct very good investigations and that it's strengths are that it can produce findings faster and has more citizen input. She said it takes about eight years for oversight to become truly rooted in a community and the people accept it for what it is – government watching government.

She said there are predictable challenges in the early days of a review board such as opposition from police managers or a political base in a community, disparagement of the Commission and/or its staff, or from the community because the people want a review board that is functioning immediately. She noted that one way the Commission can help this process grow in Riverside and minimize opposition and disappointment is to educate everyone that it will take time and face challenges, and that it doesn't mean that it's not working but that it's starting to work. She suggested compiling a history of the Commission so that the public and future commissioners will know how it all came about in order to assess how the Commission is doing and where it is going.

She stressed the importance of producing public documents, such as agendas, minutes and reports, that are interesting and "user friendly," as this will help the readers learn and understand the process and are more likely to be read. She also said it is important that the Commission avoid being identified with either the community/complainant or the Police Department, but to maintain a middle ground and to be adequately prepared and informed regarding relevant case details.

Commissioner Goldware asked if Ms. Quinn, in her experience, believed that the input that these commissions give, after being in place for a time, are accepted by the whole community or just segments of the community. Ms. Quinn responded by saying that there will be segments that are more interested than others, some of those being the police department and the complainants.

Commissioner Brewer noted that the CPRC is the type of commission that will do much of its work in closed session. He asked how communities have responded when a great deal of information cannot be disclosed. Ms. Quinn said that the Commission needs to find ways to give out as much information as possible and look at other agencies for examples.

DISCUSSION & VOTE ON METHOD OF SELECTING PERMANENT OFFICERS

Executive Director Williams said that Commissioners Goldware and Redsecker have suggested a method of selecting officers. He asked to commissioners to discuss the suggestion and vote, reminding the commissioners that a method for selecting officers should be decided at this meeting so that officers can be selected and in place by the March meeting, which is the anniversary date for the Commission.

The method of officer selection as proposed by Commissioners Goldware and Redsecker is as follows:

<u> 2000 - 2001</u>	2001 - 2002
Commissioner w/2-year term – Chair	Commissioner w/3-year term – Chair (previous
Commissioner w/3-year term – Vice-Chair	Vice-Chair)
	Commissioner w/4-year term – Vice-Chair
2002 - 2003	2002 2004
2002 - 2003	2003 - 2004
Commissioner w/4-year term – Chair (previous	<u>2003 – 2004</u> Commissioner w/4-year term – Chair (previous

A motion was made by Commissioner Goldware that this method of officer selection be accepted. Commissioner Gardner seconded. Commissioner Brewer stated that this method is not democratic, that the

proposed CPRC by-laws state that officers are to be elected annually, and that if commissioners who aren't interested in serving this year are interested in serving next year, this method excludes that possibility. Commissioner Goldware responded by saying that since there are only four commissioners currently interested in serving as officers, this method gives them all an opportunity to serve. He also noted that this method is not binding, but that it was suggested only as a means to move the Commission forward.

Commissioner Brewer also noted that the rotation method would only take care of this year. He said that others may be interested in serving as officers next year and that elections would then have to take place as stated in the proposed by-laws. Commissioner Goldware reiterated his previous comments. Commissioner Redsecker asked if Commissioner Brewer had an alternate proposal. Commissioner Brewer replied by saying that persons should be nominated and voted for by secret ballot. Commissioner Howe agreed that officer selection should be by democratic process. Commissioner Gardner suggested that they vote on the two proposed methods of officer selection and asked Commissioner Goldware if he had a preference on how he wanted to do this since it was his motion. Interim Chair Garcia called for a vote on officer selection by rotation. Vote was 6-3 against the rotation method of officer selection, with Commissioners Hendrick, Goldware and Redsecker voting yes.

Commissioner Brewer made a motion to hold secret ballot elections in March. Commissioner Gardner seconded. Interim Chair Garcia called for discussion. Commissioner Gardner suggested that there be a nomination process, whether it is self-nomination or an open nomination from the floor, for only the commissioners who have expressed an interest in serving as officers. Commissioner Huerta spoke against the motion saying that the Commission already knows who is interested in serving, that they are adequate nominees, and suggested that the secret ballot election be held in February so that the officers will be installed in March. Commissioner Goldware asked on what criteria, such as candidate's personalities, the voting would be based. Commissioner Brewer responded that that criterion is commonly used, especially in newly formed commissions or boards, until the board members get to know each other and learn how they operate. He suggested a vote this evening, using the four interested members. Executive Director Williams said that because this item wasn't on this agenda, a vote for officers could not take place at this meeting. He suggested that each interested commissioner send to the CPRC office a two-paragraph "campaign speech" on why they feel they should hold office and that after they are turned in, the "speeches" along with a ballot would be sent to the commissioners. Interim Chair Garcia asked Commissioner Brewer how he wanted to proceed with his motion. Commissioner Brewer amended his motion to reflect the suggestions of the Executive Director to send out ballots and that the vote be counted at the February monthly meeting. Commissioner Gardner seconded. Interim Chair Garcia called for a vote to accept secret ballot vote for selection of CPRC officers. Motion carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

Commissioner Howe informed the Commission that the Investigative Rules & Regulations Committee, made up of Commissioners Brewer, Egson and himself, had met several times and that the Policies & Procedures are in draft form. He said that they hope to finalize their draft next week after meeting with the General Rules & Regulations Committee. Interim Chair Garcia asked if they would see those drafts next month and Commissioner Howe said yes. Executive Director Williams noted that he hopes to have two committees get together and come up with a draft document. When this is accomplished, copies of the draft will be sent to all the commissioners for their review and input, and possibly discuss and vote on them at one of the training sessions with the February monthly meeting as a tentative target date. Vice-Chair Gardner stated that the General Rules & Regulations are in draft form, but that he had not yet had a chance to meet with the other committee. He noted that there would may be some duplication and possibly some

conflicting suggestions, and asked the other commissioners to not be surprised if they see that because that's where they are at this time. Commissioner Brewer said he'd had a chance to review the rough drafts, saying there were a number of minor changes such as dates or time limits, or to whom information would be going such as the City Manager or the Chief of Police, but saw very few differences between the documents. Commissioner Howe stated that a meeting between the four committee members, scheduled for next week, should iron out all the minor details to which Commissioner Brewer referred. He said the revised drafts would then be brought to the full Commission for review prior to the February monthly meeting.

The Commission adjourned at 7:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

PHOEBE SHERRON Administrative Clerk